

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/545,034	04/06/2000 _i .	Eduardo Cue	P2512/560	9025	
21839 75	590 03/11/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P			ZURITA, J	ZURITA, JAMES H	
	POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404 ART UNIT PAPER NU		PAPER NUMBER		
	-,		3625		

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/545,034	CUE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H Zurita	3625	MU
The MAILING DATE f this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicate a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a Ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of to (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CF f extension and the corresponding amound the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final (on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	•
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);		
(c)	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.	•		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			ınd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-71</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	Weffrey A. Smith Primary Examiner		

Applicati n No. 009/545,034

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: in proposed amendment, configuration data is solely determined by administrator, expanding scope of claims...

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (a) request for reconsideration is not persuasive, (b) one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually (c) claims recite nonfunctional descriptive material which, when reading claims as a whole, carries little patentable weight and does not distinguish the invention from prior art and which is not functionall involved in the steps recited..